

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Application No. 10/077,601
Filed: February 15, 2002
TC Art Unit: 1756
Confirmation No.: 1545

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Toth (WO 00/33142).

Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the optical storage medium includes a polymer material that has an optically activated molecular transition so that it can be optically written and read at about the same wavelength. Toth uses a liquid crystal material that writes at either a blue or green wavelength and is read at a red wavelength. This fails to disclose or suggest the storage medium of claim 1.

Claims 1-4 and 6-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rao ('525). However, Rao ('525) relates to a switch or modulator and is not used for storing and retrieving data in a medium.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Natansohn ('381). However, Natansohn states only that the film can be read using "holographic techniques" or by "monitoring the light transmitted through a crossed polarizer set-up." There is no further description of the light used to read the medium. There is no indication that the medium is writeable and readable with light at about the same wavelength. With regard to Claim 7, Natansohn fails to disclose or suggest a system that

Application No. 10/077,601
Filed: February 15, 2002
TC Art Unit: 1756
Confirmation No.: 1545

uses a first coherent light source and a second light source with first and second polarization components, respectively, to record information. Natansohn discloses the use on an argon laser (column 7, line 65) to write or erase.

Claims 1-7 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Savant ('221). Savant teaches using different wavelengths to write and read the same portion of material. Savant fails to disclose or suggest writing and reading with about the same wavelength or using two different light sources to write on the medium.

Claims 1-11 and 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishii ('849). Ishii fails to disclose or suggest a medium that is written and read at about the same wavelength or that use two different light sources to write.

Claims 7, 12, 14 and 16-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 103(a) as being anticipated by or obvious over Kawakubo. As Kawakubo fails to disclose or suggest the use of a polymer film having the recited characteristics it fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention.

Claim 1-27 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Ishii in view of Kawakubo, Savant and Tsujioka or further in view of Taniguchi and Taylor. These

-10-

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGEN,
GASNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP
TEL. (617) 542-2290
FAX (617) 542-2290

Application No. 10/077,601
Filed: February 15, 2002
TC Art Unit: 1756
Confirmation No.: 1545


references fail to disclose alone, or in combination, a system or method of writing or reading at about the same wavelength. They also fail to disclose or suggest a system for storing information using two light sources as recited in Claim 7 or Claim 23. New Claims 28-32 have been added. The cited references fail to disclose a nonvolatile optical storage medium as recited in Claim 28. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

PENGFEI WU, ET AL.

By:


THOMAS O. HOOVER
Registration No. 32,470
Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 542-2290
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

TOH/dxr
317393_1

-11-

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP
TEL. (617) 542-2290

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.